

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Guited States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1480 Www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 09/899,929 | 07/09/2001 | Takaaki Murata | 02887.0144-01 | 7152 |
| 22852 | 7590 11/13/2003 | | EXAMINER | |
| FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER | | | TRAN, THAO T | |
| LLP 1300 I STRE | ET. NW | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | WASHINGTON, DC 20005 | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| | | | DATE MAR ED: 11/13/2003 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/899,929 | MURATA ET AL. |
| Autiony Aution | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Thao T. Tran | 1711 |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address |
| THE REPLY FILED 24 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | roid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely | ation. A proper reply to a |
| PERIOD FOR RE | PLY [check either a) or b)] | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date | • | in the Cool naisetien, which are in later. In |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail | g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (s | see NOTE below); |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b | elow); | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mate | rially reducing or simplifying the |
| (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceliNOTE: | ng a corresponding number of fi | nally rejected claims. |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | ion(s): | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a se | eparate, timely filed amendment |
| 5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See | | dered but does NOT place the |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY t | o issues which were newly |
| 7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>36-44</u> . | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 20-22. | | |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is | a) approved or b) disapp | roved by the Examiner. |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer | nt(s)(PTO-1449) | |
| 10. Other: | | |
| | | RABON SERGENT PRIMARY EXAMINER |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The final rejection still stands. Contrary to Applicants' arguments, Miyagawa, as shown in Fig. 10 and col. 7, ln. 12-24, does teach electrodes 2 and 3 formed on one surface of dielectric 1 and electrode 5 on the other surface of the dielectric. Hence Miyagawa's invention does read on the presently claimed invention.

RABON SERGENT PRIMARY EXAMINED